

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 10-18 are pending in the application, with claim 10 being the independent claim. Claims 1-9 and 19-55 were previously canceled. Claims 10-18 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0091056 to Surace *et al.* ("Surace"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended independent claim 10 as follows:

A method of providing a voice user interface for a user comprising:

enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host;

storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and

generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information.

Surace does not teach or suggest each of the foregoing features of claim 10. For example, Surace does not teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

As described in the specification of the present application, "a user is able to indicate in his or her profile specific character traits such as tone 321, sex 322, accent 323, formality 324, speed 325, character 326, and background 327 to develop a personality for the VUI host." (Specification, paragraph [0195]). Surace, on the other hand, describes developing a personality for a voice user interface as follows:

In particular, those skilled in the art of, for example, social psychology review the application requirements, and *they then determine which personality types best serve the delivery of a voice user interface* for the functions or services included in the application requirements. A personality or multiple personalities are selected, and a complete description is created of a stereotypical person displaying the selected personality or personalities, such as age, gender, education, employment history, and current employment position. Scenarios are developed for verbal interaction between the stereotypical person and typical users. (Surace at paragraph [0043], emphasis added).

In one embodiment, the subscriber selects from several different personalities when selecting a virtual assistant. For example, the subscriber can interview virtual assistants with different personalities in order to choose the voice user interface with a personality that is best suited for the subscriber's needs, business, or the subscriber's own personality. (Surace at paragraph [0113]).

Thus, as described by Surace, persons of skill in the art (e.g., social psychologists), as opposed to the user of the voice user interface, specify the character traits for creating virtual hosts with different personalities. Surace's method is different from the method of claim 10, which enables the user of the voice user interface to

specify and save character traits for a virtual host in a user profile, from which a personality for the virtual host is generated.

Since Surace fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 10, Surace fails to anticipate claim 10. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,339 to Staples *et al.* ("Staples"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Staples does not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace and Staples fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace nor Staples, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace and Staples fails to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claim 11 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which it depends, and further in view of its own features.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,189,702 to Sakurai *et al.* ("Sakurai"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Sakurai does not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace and Sakurai fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace nor Sakurai, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace and Sakurai fails to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claim 12 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which it depends, and further in view of its own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,768,508 to Eikeland *et al.* ("Eikeland"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Eikeland does not supply the missing

teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace and Eikeland fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace nor Eikeland, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace and Eikeland fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness rejection of claim 13 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which it depends, and further in view of its own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,911,043 to Duffy *et al.* ("Duffy"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Duffy does not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace and Duffy fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace nor Duffy, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace and Duffy fails to support a

prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claim 14 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which it depends, and further in view of its own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,882 to Bijl *et al.* ("Bijl"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Bijl does not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace and Bijl fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace nor Bijl, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace and Bijl fails to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claim 15 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which it depends, and further in view of its own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,531,184 to Wigan *et al.* ("Wigan"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Wigan does not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace and Wigan fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace nor Wigan, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace and Wigan fails to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claim 16 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which it depends, and further in view of its own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace in view of Wigan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,103 to Surace *et al.* ("Surace '103") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,029,085 to Ito ("Ito"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Wigan, Surace '103 and Ito do not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, any combination of Surace, Wigan, Surace '103, and Ito fails to teach or suggest "enabling the user to specify personality information for a virtual host; storing the personality information in a user profile having

preference information for the user; and generating a virtual host with a consistent personality in accordance with the personality information," as recited in claim 10.

Since neither Surace, Wigan, Surace '103 nor Ito, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 10, the combination of Surace, Wigan, Surace '103, and Ito fails to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claims 17 and 18 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which they depend and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.



***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Nicole D. Dretar  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 54,076

Date: 08-04-2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

398113\_1.DOC